



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,167	10/23/2003	Kulvir S. Bhogal	AUS920030860US1	1937
35525	7590	02/25/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			CHUNG, DANIEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2672	

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,167

Applicant(s)

BHOGAL, KULVIR S.

Examiner

Daniel J Chung

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-23-03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

Receipt is acknowledged of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement of 10-23-2003, which has been placed in the application file and considered by the Examiner.

Drawings

The drawings are not objected to by the Examiner.

Specification

Please review the application and correct all informalities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to independent claim 1 line 7,

The phrase "...regions portions of the screen." it is not understood as to how one determines what is "the regions portions of the screen" should be? Thus, the claim is vague and indefinite. In order to expedite the processing of pending application, in

claim 1 "...regions portions of the screen..." should apparently read "...other regions of the screen", as illustrated in other independent claims. Applicant is respectfully requested to carefully review all claims for any other informalities that require correction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by
Gaughan et al. (5,589,893)

Regarding claim 1, Gaughan et al discloses that the claimed feature of a computer implemented method for selectively increasing illumination of a region of a screen, the method comprising: responsive to identifying [i.e. "accessed by cursor" 56] a region [i.e. 'one of control function are', 'one of screen areas'; 58,60,62,64] on the screen, altering [i.e. "illuminated", "highlighted"] a display intensity of the screen within the region, wherein the display intensity of the screen within the region is greater than regions portions of the screen; determining whether the region has been redefined ['by cursor movement']; and responsive to the region being redefined to form a redefined region [i.e. 'another screen areas'] , altering [i.e. "illuminated", "highlighted"] the display

Art Unit: 2672

intensity of the screen within the redefined region. (See Fig 4, Fig 9, Abstract line 11-17, col 4 line 40-col 6 line 6)

Regarding claim 2, Gaughan et al discloses that the region is in a first location and wherein the redefined region is in a second location. (See Fig 4)

Regarding claim 3, Gaughan et al discloses that determining whether the pointer [i.e. "cursor"; 56] has moved to a new location [i.e. 'another screen area by cursor movement'] on the screen, wherein movement of the pointer to the new location results in movement of the region to the new location to form the redefined region. (See Fig 4, col 4 line 40-col 6 line 6)

Regarding claim 4, Gaughan et al discloses that determining whether a new window [i.e. "window area"] has become the active window, wherein the new window becoming the active window results in the region being redefined to form the redefined region. (See Fig 4, Fig 9, col 5 line 27-col 6 line 6)

Regarding claim 5, Gaughan et al discloses that the regions has a shape selected from one of a circle, a square, or a rectangle. (See 'rectangle shape' in Fig 4)

Regarding claim 6, Gaughan et al discloses that the region is defined by a window displayed on the screen. (See 'window' in Fig 4, 9)

Regarding claims 7-8, claims 7-8 are similar in scope to the claim 1, and thus the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claims 7-8.

Regarding claims 9-13, claims 9-13 are similar in scope to the claims 2-6, and thus the rejections to claims 2-6 hereinabove are also applicable to claims 9-13.

Regarding claims 14-19, claims 14-19 are similar in scope to the claims 1-6, and thus the rejections to claims 1-6 hereinabove are also applicable to claims 14-19.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Chung whose telephone number is (703) 306-3419. He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 7:30am- 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael, Razavi, can be reached at (703) 305-4713.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2672


(703) 872-9306 (Central fax)

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

djc
February 18, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'djc' followed by a long horizontal stroke.